DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 862 TM 870 563

AUTHOR McKenna, Bonnie; And Others
TITLE The Nature of Selection and Judging for the Teacher of the Year Award.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Awards; Competitive Selection; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Judges; National Surveys; *Professional Recognition; Standards; State Programs; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Validity
IDENTIFIERS Council of Chief State School Officers; *Teacher of the Year

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the investigation of the operation of the Teacher of the Year Award program in 28 states. It focuses on the method of selection for recipients of this award, and explores the nature of the judging process used in selecting candidates at both the state and national levels. Specific objectives are: (1) to determine the criteria and procedures used for selection of award recipients; (2) to document how judges are selected and to describe the training these judges receive; and (3) to compare the selection and training procedures for judges of the Teacher of the Year Award with procedures used in other disciplines. The study indicates that judges of livestock and dog competitions receive more training and experience than those who select the teacher of the year. Data from this study suggest that the conceptions of teaching and its evaluation which are reflected by this award, if not inaccurate, are disconcerting. Classroom behaviors, application of verified teaching strategies, and effects upon students are included in the selection criteria utilized by only two of the 28 states in the sample. A number of policy implications are explored in this analysis. (Author/MDE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED287862

The Nature Of Selection And Judging For The Teacher Of The Year Award

Bonnie McKenna, Kathy Carter, David C. Berliner
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. McKenna

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1987.

TM 870 563

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper reports the results of an investigation of how the Teacher of the Year Award operates. It focuses on the method of selection for recipients of this award and explores the nature of the judging process used in selecting candidates at both the state and national level. Specific objectives of this study were: (1) to determine the criteria and procedures used for selection of award recipients; (2) to document how judges are selected and to describe the training these judges receive; (3) to explore how selection and training procedures for judges of the Teacher of the Year Award compare with procedures used in other disciplines. Data from this study indicate that the conceptions of teaching and its evaluation which are reflected by this symbol, if not inaccurate, are disconcerting. A number of policy implications are drawn from results and explored in this analysis.

The Nature Of Selection And Judging For The Teacher Of The Year Award

Bonnie McKenna, Kathy Carter, David Berliner
University of Arizona

Dogs win best of show. Cattle and horses receive ribbons. Sports competitors vie for medals. And the Teacher of the Year wins a crystal apple. How is the Teacher of the Year judged, and how does this judging compare with judging in other areas?

This paper reports the results of an investigation of how the Teacher of the Year award operates, with particular attention to the nature of the judging process used in selecting candidates at both the state and national level. The Teacher of the Year program has been in existence for 35 years to "reward excellence in teaching" (Council of Chief State School Officers, a, p. 1). At the present time, there are three sponsors of the program: the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Encyclopedia Britannica Companies, and Good Housekeeping magazine. Candidates are judged at state and national levels, and the winner is announced in a Spring issue of Good Housekeeping.

To date, few attempts have been made to examine closely the Teacher of the Year award. What research has been done has focused primarily on describing recipients' backgrounds, their personalities, and their personal characteristics (Goldsmid, Gruber & Wilson, 1977; Tursman, 1981; Van Schaack & Glick, 1982; Wiedmer, 1983). Taken together, results from these studies suggest that award recipients are warm, enthusiastic, communicative, committed, hard-working, and caring individuals who express a common concern for their students' well-being. The background and profile information provided through these studies is

interesting, but it leaves a number of important questions unanswered and a number of evaluation and policy issues unexplored. How do these winners become winners? How are judges of this award selected? What kind of training do these judges receive? How does the selection and training of judges for the Teacher of the Year compare with practices in other fields? Finally, what implications do these selection and judging practices have for the evaluation of good teaching and for policy decisions regarding the recognition of expert teachers?

METHOD

Several different methods were used in this study to explore various aspects of the Teacher of the Year Award. To examine what selection procedures are used to determine award winners and to identify judges, structured phone interviews were conducted with state and national contest representatives, and original documents used in the selection process were collected. At the national level, the primary source of information was two representatives for The Council of Chief State School Officers, the group who oversees the award program. One of these representatives was the former Coordinator for the Teacher of the Year Award program. The second representative recently became Coordinator of the program.

State level information and data were collected from competition representatives from 28 different states. Table 1 lists states from which data were obtained.

--Insert Table 1 about here--

These states were selected to represent the major geographical regions in the United States. Phone interviews with competition representatives averaged 26 minutes in length and provided detailed information about the state and national program operation, selection criteria, judging

techniques, and prizes awarded. Twenty-two state contest coordinators also responded to a request to provide packets of written material about the Teacher of the Year Program for their states.

Original documents, texts, and journal articles were systematically reviewed to gather information about judging in other fields. In addition, structured interviews were conducted with knowledgeable representatives from such fields as dog, livestock, and sports judging to explore similarities and differences in selection and training of judges in these fields with procedures used in education.

FINDINGS

Data yielded rich information regarding various aspects of the Teacher of the Year competition. In the next sections, findings will be described as they relate to (1) selection criteria and procedures for the award at both the national and state levels; (2) selection and training procedures for Award judges, and (3) selection and judging practices in fields other than Education.

Selection Criteria and Procedures for the Teacher of the Year Award

National Criteria and Procedures

Interviews with national representatives suggested a prevailing orientation among the Council of Chief State School Officers toward state autonomy and flexibililty in award selection procedures. Council spokespersons emphasized that states and local school districts are most qualified to select the best teachers. Therefore, national guidelines were deliberately designed to be "loose" (D. Pierce, personal communication, March 19, 1986), to "suggest" rather than dictate criteria. In turn, each state is encouraged to develop its own methods to select the candidate for the national competition.

This looseness is apparent in the printed national guidelines for selecting candidates:

> Your candidate should be an exceptionally skillful and dedicated teacher in any state-approved or accredited school, pre-kindergarten through grade twelve, who is planning to continue in an active teaching status.... Candidates should have the respect and admiration of students, parents and co-workers. They should play active and useful roles in their communities as well as in their schools, often distinguishing themselves as leaders.
>
> Since the award carries with it a number of public appearances, your candidate should be poised and articulate and should have the energy and equanimity to withstand a busy schedule. While all of these qualifications are to be considered, the most important one is a superior ability to inspire students of all backgrounds and abilities to learn (Council of Chief State School Officers, b, p.1).

In the words of one Council representative, the most important selection criteria is that "the teacher must like children," (J. Neiman, personal communication, February 5, 1986).

Council representatives reported that the national selection process begins when the one winner from each state submits a portfolio to the national selection committee appointed by the Council of Chief State School Officers for their consideration. This portfolio must contain five sections:

(1) identification;

(2) a biographical sketch (preferably in narrative format which includes information about the teacher's early environment as

well as reference to events which may have affected his/her decision to become a teacher);

(3) a statement of the candidate's philosophy of teaching (written by the candidate to express his/her commitment to the profession);

(4) a record of professional development (including information regarding participation in professional organizations and service on committees, commissions, task forces, and the like);

(5) a record of educational and civic service in philanthropic, civic, and/or community organizations.

Based solely on the written material submitted by each state's candidate, a panel of ten judges determines four finalists for the Award. These four finalists are visited by a representative from Good Housekeeping magazine. This representative videotapes an interview with each of the four finalists, observes the teachers in their classrooms, and consults with the teacher's colleagues. The final step in the selection process occurs when information collected by the magazine representative on each of the four candidates is turned over to the ten member national selection committee, who decides the winner.

The national winner is honored at a ceremony at the White House, receives an engraved citation and a handcrafted crystal apple, and is featured with the finalists in an article in Good Housekeeping magazine.

State Level Criteria and Procedures

Contest representatives from all but two states in the sample reported organizing the Teacher of the Year program through the State Department of Education office. In the other two states the teachers'

union selects the State Teacher of the Year.

Information obtained from state contest representatives suggested considerable variation across states in the methods used to nominate and select Award candidates. Different states opted to ask principals, central office administrators, peers, parents and/or students to nominate a candidate for Teacher of the Year. In some states, numbers of nominations are unlimited, and nominations are submitted directly to a state selection committee for screening and for selecting a single candidate to compete nationally. In other states, a formula is applied to limit the number of nominations to be sent to the state level screening committee, and the process is more complex. For example, one state representative described his state's nomination procedures as "layered". In this state, the process begins at the local district level, and candidates must advance through several screenings. Initially, a Teacher of the Year for a particular school is selected, who must then compete for the position of District Teacher of the Year. The district winner must vie for the regional title, and the Regional Teacher of the Year must ultimately compete for State Teacher of the Year.

Nine of the 28 states reported selecting the state nominee solely from the written material submitted by candidates. Nine other states indicated that judgments are made based on the written material and an interview with finalists. Only 10 of the 28 states sampled for this study indicated that they conducted any kind of classroom observation as a part of the selection process. In one of these ten states the "observations" were made from videotapes submitted by the candidates.

One western state coordinator commented that state decision-makers felt it was not productive to observe candidates' teaching and

interactions with students. This interviewee's stated position was that decisions about nominees were not enhanced by classroom observations; "[they] could make just as good a choice without observing the candidates." An eastern state representative reported that while funding problems prevented such an effort, classroom observations would be viewed positively by a number of individuals closely involved with the program in her state. She noted that it would be "wonderful" to be able to observe the nominees before determining a single candidate to compete in the national contest. Another eastern state coordinator had a different opinion, however, he did not think that classroom observations would be valuable because the people who would conduct the observations would simply come back to the selection committee with "champions". One midwestern state representative whose state selection committee does not observe or interview the candidates reported that while the committee feels that an interview might be valuable, it would probably be too time consuming.

Interview and written records suggested that a "typical" state selection process could be characterized in the following way: the selection committee through the various methods--written, written-interview, or written-interview-observation--comes to a consensus and narrows the field of candidates down to several semi-finalists. Some states do this by giving point values to specified criteria, and the candidate with the highest score is selected. Other state committees rank candidates without "scoring" portfolios and, through discussion, try to come to agreement about the rankings.

For those states where interviews and observations are part of the process, semi-finalists rather than actual winners are selected from the

process described above. These semi-finalists are then interviewed and/or observed. In some states, only one member of the judging committee is appointed to accomplish all the observations and interviews. In two states, however, the entire panel of judges spends time with each teacher at his/her school and talks with the teacher's students and co-workers. Finally, the selection committee narrows the candidates down to one winner.

All of the states sampled reported using the "suggested" national criteria as the basis for the selection. Indeed, many of the states use the criteria from the Council of Chief State School Officers without any elaboration. Data indicated, however, that states often emphasized different areas of the criteria in their selection procedures. Some states suggested that community involvement was the most important area in determining finalists. Other state representatives noted a belief that innovative and exceptional teaching activities were most salient. Still other states stressed that selection was based most readily on the teacher's demonstrated ability to be a "change agent" in the school or community. To other states, the factor that weighed most prominently in selection was the candidate's history of spending time "above and beyond what is expected" in his or her work. Many state representatives appeared to agree that a "well rounded" person made the best candidate for the Teacher of the Year.

One state coordinator (who asked researchers to preserve his anonymity) expressed his uneasiness with the guidelines passed from the national level to the state level. He reported he had been "begging the Council to come up with better criteria." He commented that, "you have to take this memo and fly by the seat of your pants and somehow make it work." Another state coordinator voiced milder criticism, saying:

"the criteria works as well as anything; however, all those things are flawed. When the candidates get to the interview session, then the public relations angle becomes most important. Basically, there is no good way to judge classroom performance."

Similarly, an eastern state coordinator argued that "the Teacher of the Year is really promoted as a speaker" and that "the committee does not really evaluate professional ability." A western state coordinator felt that "the selection process is geared to the candidates who make the best written presentation." Another western state coordinator felt that the person selected was "basically lucky with some kind of 'PR' angle." He stated, "the winners have to have that something extra, and they also have to have a good notebook."

Data indicated that most states do, in fact, require the candidates to submit a written portfolio containing the sections recommended in the national program guidelines. Most states also ask the person who nominated the candidate to address the issue about why the candidate should be selected. The majority of states also request that candidates submit letters from references.

Only two of the 28 states in the sample actually reported addressing teaching issues directly in selection criteria. One of these states specifically asked the judges to look for the following:

the teacher's use of class time, evidence of student responsibility for learning, how the teacher assesses student's skill levels, whether classroom goals and objectives are clear, the teacher's classroom management style, whether there is a variety of

teaching techniques; if the teacher reviews the material; whether the teacher conveys the purpose of the lesson; if the teacher uses clear and relevant language;, whether visual and auditory senses are used; if the students are actively involved; if feedback is appropriate; and whether there is time for practice and a summary.

Data strongly indicated that this look at specific areas of teaching in this kind of detail was rare. Indeed, most state representatives indicated an alternative focus on candidates' volunteer work, the extra time they spent at their work, their leadership qualities, the ways they had worked to improve the profession, special and innovative practices, spokes[man]ship ability, whether they helped their colleagues, and whether they were unique.

After the state winner is selected, a public announcement is made, and usually there is some kind of press coverage. Interview data revealed that the awards for the Teacher of the Year vary considerably from state to state. Reported monetary awards ranged from $.00 to $5,000. Some states award the winners travel expenses so that they may act as ambassadors and spokespersons for the profession. In one state in the sample, the winning teacher receives the use of a new car for one year. State winners may receive yet other kinds of prizes, including certificates, bowls, plaques, ashtrays, paperweights, trophies, flowers and/or a replica of a set of encyclopedias. Many other winners are honored at ceremonies, luncheons, and dinners at State Board meetings, at the state Governor's mansion, or at union meetings. In some states, winners are presented to and recognized by the state legislature. Indeed, two states in the sample gave the Teacher of the Year an

opportunity to address the legislature. Often, winners are asked to serve on committees concerned with addressing educational issues. Finally, one state reported reimbursing the winner's school district with one half of the teacher's salary so that the district can hire a first year teacher who has the opportunity to co-teach with the Teacher of the Year. This new teacher assumes the Award winner's responsibilities in the classroom when he or she must be away to attend a speaking engagement or to accomplish committee work.

It is interesting to note that some data from Wiedmer's (1983) study suggest that Teacher of the Year winners had mixed reactions about the recognition and prizes they received. One award winner said, "Becoming Teacher of the Year was one of the highlights of my career. I was overwhelmed with all the attention and recognition." (p. 402). Another Teacher of the Year reacted differently, saying "In my state, it is a joke. The Teachers of the Year are ignored. There is no use made of their expertise. I repeat JOKE. A silver bowl? Give me a break!" (p. 402).

Selection and Training of Teacher of the Year Award Judges

At the national level, the screening committee for the Teacher of the Year Award is a ten member committee appointed annually by the Council of Chief State School Officers. Interviews with national representatives indicated that these ten members serve anonymously. They also serve without pay. Members are typically representatives from major professional organizations involved in education and representatives from the National Office of State School Officers.

Interviews revealed that no training is required or provided for these judges, but, according to one national representative, "many of

the judges have been doing it for a long time." (J. Neiman, personal communication, March 28, 1986).

Data collected from state representatives revealed considerable variation in the make-up of judging committees. Across the states sampled for this study, judges were drawn from a range of different groups, including: school administrators' organizations, teachers' unions, business and industry personnel, school food service employees, school board members, former Award winners, State Department of Education staff, students, other teachers, university professors, vocational education specialists, teacher certification personnel, "interested" community residents, state curriculum developers, and state legislators.

Training for these judges was practically non-existant. Only two of the 28 states mentioned providing or requiring training for judges on the state selection committee. It should be noted that in these two instances, the training involved, at most, a 1/2 day session. Content scheduled for coverage in training sessions included a discussion of selection criteria, a review of the previous year's program and changes to be noted in that program, and a discussion regarding how points would be awarded and rankings of candidates would be accomplished.

Not only did the majority of states in the sample indicate they refrained from requiring or offering training for the Teacher of the Year Award, but they also suggested that a high turn-over rate exists on most state panels. Data from state representatives suggest that typically, new judges are selected each year. The few judges on the state selection committee with previous judging experience are usually Department of Education staff. Most other panel members serve and are replaced annually. One state coordinator explained that they "like to

pass the honor of judging around to everyone in order to give everyone a chance."

Selection and Training of Judges in Other Fields

Judging in other fields was explored in an attempt to determine procedures others use to judge and award excellence. This preliminary look outside the field of education indicated that other fields exercise comparatively more care in the recruitment and training of judges. For example, to become a provisional breed dog judge for the American Kennel Club, one must meet the following requirements:

--Have 10 years documented experience in the sport. (Documentation might show date of first litters, exhibiting, and club membership.);

--Have owned several dogs of the initial breed(s) requested;

--Have bred and raised 4 litters in initial breed requested. (Co-owned litters not raised on applicant's premises do not meet this requirement.);

--Have produced 2 champions out of the minimum 4 litters, whether or not owned or handled by the applicant;

--Have 5 stewarding assignments at AKC Member or Licensed shows;

--Have judged 6 sanctioned matches, Sweepstakes or Futurities. (Fun matches, Junior Showmanship or Obedience assignments are not acceptable.);

--Have passed a comprehensive "open-book" examination to demonstrate understanding of AKC Rules, Policies

and Judging Procedures;

--Have passed a test on the standard of each breed requested. A monthly schedule of test sites is available on request;

--Must be interviewed. The purpose of the interview is to allow the applicant to personally discuss breed knowledge and qualifications with established experts;

--Must have submitted two references for the initial breed requested, and one reference for each subsequent breed. (Failure to meet reference requirements one month prior to the Board's consideration results in the candidate's application being held without processing;

--must meet the occupational eligibility requirements under AKC Rules as stated in the "Dog Show Rules," Chapter 10,Section 1 (AKC, 1986a).

Moreover, after the applicant has submitted the forms described above and has passed the required examinations, the applicant's name is published in the Gazette (a publication for dog breeders) in order that interested persons can offer their opinions of the applicant's qualifications.

In Guidelines for Dog Show Judges (1980), the American Kennel Club emphasizes that since judging dogs is a highly subjective process, it carries with it significant responsibility. The literature from the American Kennel Club (AKC, 1980, 1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1986c) points out that judging awards directly influence breeding trends. Thus, it is critical for a judge to possess substantive breed knowledge and to

illustrate his or her knowledge by breeding, showing, and stewarding animals. Other pertinent documentation reviewed for this portion of the study suggested that dog judges are required to update their knowledge by attending breed seminars and by continually working to develop their understandings of breed standards. Guidelines supplied to judges provide detailed documentation about judging processes, including how to assemble the "class", how to regulate the speed of judging, and how to follow the established judging routine (AKC, 1980). Explicit directions are provided for such aspects of judging as forming a first impression, conducting an individual examination, opening a dog's mouth, placing the dogs, and marking the judge's book.

Brown (1977) discusses the importance of dog judging and the decisions judges make in his book about field trials. Brown notes that since judges are required to evaluate such subjective aspects as the dogs' animation, snappiness, merriness, independence, and initiative, they need to be keen and accurate observers. In his assessment, only a judge with rich practical experience can weigh exactly the precise actions of an exquisite exhibition that decides a close race.

Rigid requirements must also be met by livestock judging candidates. These people typically spend years preparing and training to become a judge. A livestock judging coach at a major research university in the west explained what she felt to be the "typical" process for becoming a livestock judge (S. Easterday, personal communication, March 12, 1986). She suggested that although there are a variety of ways to become a livestock judge, the most popular method is to complete a collegiate judging program. Many students who enroll in such programs have had early experiences with livestock as

members of 4H and Future Farmers of America organizations. Before they compete to become members of the collegiate judging team, most students take a minimum of one year of livestock evaluation courses at a university. During their second year in a collegiate program, students compete against their peers for membership on the Livestock Judging Team. Members who are selected for the team must subsequently compete with livestock judging teams from other universities. College judging teams are evaluated on the degree of match between their ratings of animals with those of experienced and expert judge's.

Another reputable and practicing professional in the livestock industry reported that big livestock judging schools have "tremendous" recruitment and training programs (J. Woodin, personal communication, February, 1986). Before a contest, teams from such schools have a reputation of practicing livestock judging 4 to 5 hours per day. Apparently, it is often through university judging competitions offered through the universities that individuals can earn the reputation ultimately required to be named an expert judge. Some individuals are able to advance to the level of State Fair Judge through the power of their reputation. Most livestock judges, like dog show judges, are breeders themselves. Livestock judges, once established, are called on repeatedly by the livestock industry. High turnover rates in judging pools were reported to be extremely uncommon. As was noted, "There is alot of money involved in livestock and in raising livestock, so it is important to have well-trained judges. The judges have tremendous power to influence the breeding style of an animal." (S. Easterday, personal communication, March 12, 1986).

Basic and widely-used handbooks concerned with livestock evaluation (see, for example Beeson, Hunsley & Nordby, 1970; Philips, 1956; Youtz &

Carlson, 1962) elaborate longstanding methods for judging livestock. Detailed guidelines for livestock judging also exist, which suggest that one must acquire a sense of an "ideal" animal. For example, in market and feeder beef cattle, one is directed to look at the general appearance of the animal, its head and neck, forequarters, body, hips rump, quarter, twist and legs. Terms to describe a desirable steer are "more muscling", "thicker fleshed", "higher cutability", "mellower in cover", "superior handling qualities", "pliable hide", "meatier steer", "pleasing general appearance", "tidier trimmer underline", "free from wrinkles", and "style" (Youtz & Carlson, 1962, p.9-14). Judges must know proper means to judge the animal while it is alive, and must then employ additional techniques to evaluate the carcass.

Sports judges are also required to undergo substantive training prior to being selected to serve on a judging team. In their recent article concerned with sports judging, Green and Allen (1984) argue that where there is a judged sport, there is the potential for controversy. These authors maintain that inexperienced or improperly trained judges make poor decisions. Moreover, they suggest that because of cultural biases, scoring rules are always open to different interpretations, and therefore a judge is only as good as her or his education, training and experience.

This article documents that countries with well developed national and international competitive sports programs have highly developed training programs for judges. Judges in these countries spend considerable time and money perfecting their judging skills by attending clinics and conferences. For example, in gymnastics and synchronized swimming, it takes seven years to achieve and retain national judging

status. For figure skating, it can take ten to 15 years to become nationally and internationally certified. With a certified rating, a judge may have the equivalent of a master's or doctoral degree in the sport.

Discussion

As has been stated, the National Teacher of the Year Award exists to recognize "excellence in teaching". Although only one national winner is selected annually, the Teacher of the Year program emphasizes that the winner is a symbol for all good teachers and for good teaching everywhere.

This study sought to ask a number of questions about this important symbol. Specifically, it sought to determine how winners were selected, how judges for this award were chosen and trained, and how judging and training practices for this teaching award compared with methods used in other fields. These questions actually originated out of a broader question, which was: Does this award and practices associated with this award reflect an accurate conception of what excellent teaching is and of how good teaching is best evaluated? Data from this study indicate that conceptions of teaching and its evaluation reflected by this symbol, if not inaccurate, are disconcerting.

A review of selection criteria and procedures for this award suggest a conception of excellent teaching that has little to do with actual teaching. In essence, this award for "excellent teaching" gives little weight to a candidate's demonstrated skill in the teaching and learning environment. Candidates' qualifications, for the most part, are demonstrated through written portfolios which summarize such things as their teaching philosophy, professional development, education, and civic service. One might certainly argue that the conception of

teaching reflected in the criteria for this award are different, if not incompatible, with views of successful teaching drawn from recent research on teaching. Much of the recent research on teaching has suggested that classroom teaching is a complex phenomenon. However, this complexity does not appear to be reflected in the selection criteria and procedures used to determine Teacher of the Year winners nor in the selection and training requirements for judges.

The fact that legislators, food service employees, teachers, personnel from business and industry, and a host of other persons from various groups are considered "qualified" judges for this competition suggests a prevailing attitude that almost anyone is capable of judging good teaching. Moreover, it suggests that the judgments about good teaching can be made apart from a professional knowledge base. To be sure, a preliminary look at dog, livestock, and sports competitions suggests that these fields impose much higher standards for the recruitment and training of qualified judges. In addition, these fields use comparatively more well-formed criteria with an "ideal" standard firmly etched, taught, and updated for practicing judges. The authors recognize that the field of teaching has long been and is presently struggling to find this "ideal." Yet while this definition has historically seemed elusive, much progress has been made in recent years in determining a number of standard practices associated with good teaching (see, for example, Brophy and Good, 1986; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986), and some researchers are presently attempting to unravel the nature of expertise in teaching (see, for example, Berliner, 1986; Carter, 1985, 1986; Carter, Sabers, Cushing, Pinnegar, Berliner,in press; Housner and Griffey, 1985; Leinhardt, 1986).

It should be noted that many Teaching Award representatives interviewed for this study indicated they would like to see improvements made in the program. They suggest that the lack of money and support for the program often restricts improvement efforts. Presently, no federal funds exist to support the program. A few state legislatures have managed to fund minimal support at the state level, but such funding is rare. Moreover, the teaching profession itself, through its national organizations, does not presently contribute resources or expertise to this enterprise.

Representatives also noted that the program was often poorly publicized. Part of the national campaign for this program is the featured article in Good Housekeeping magazine about the present year's winner and runners-up. It is interesting to note the nature of this coverage in the May, 1986, issue (Miller, 1986). No headline about the article covering this award appeared on the front cover of the magazine. Instead, the cover advertised, "Our Perfect Parties Cookbook - 6 Menus That Let You Enjoy the Party Too!", "Color Yourself Beautiful with the New Pastel Makeups," "Can You Believe No More Heart Attacks, Body Fat, Strokes?" and carried a close-up shot of Sophia Loren. It is worrisome to consider the damaging impact this kind of coverage potentially carries for prevailing views of practicing teachers and teaching.

This award is a powerful symbol with the potential to have a strong impact on the teaching profession, on the status of teachers, and prevailing understandings of what excellent teaching is. Such symbols are especially important at a time when states and school districts are developing criteria and procedures for selecting master teachers. This paper makes the case that comparatively more care should be taken to insure that selection procedures for this award reflect a more accurate

conception of teaching and that only those judges who are highly-qualified, trained, and knowledgeable about teaching are asked to make decisions about how good teaching gets represented by this award. Perhaps policy makers can take action to obtain funds to support the program to insure that teachers are aptly rewarded for the work they do with students and that the good work of teachers in the classroom environment is appropriately recognized. Such action would likely result in a much more positive view of the Award than the one held by a state coordinator (with a long history of involvement with the program). In his words:

> "What do you do with a Teacher of the Year after you have one? You do it all over again."

REFERENCES

American Kennel Club. (1980). Guideline for dog show judges. New York, N.Y.

American Kennel Club. (1983). Judge's examination. New York, N.Y.

American Kennal Club. (amended 1985). Rules applying to registration and dog shows. New York, N.Y.

American Kennel Club. (1986a). Provisional breed judging requirements. New York, N.Y.

American Kennel Club. (1986b). Provisional judging application. New York, N.Y.

American Kennel Club. (1986c). Provisional Breed Questionnaire. New York, N.Y.

Beeson, W. M., Hunsley, R. E. & Nordby, J. E. (1970). Livestock judging and evaluation: A handbook for students. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Educational Researcher, 15 (7), 5-13.

Brophy, J. & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd Edition (pp.328-375). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Brown, W. F. (1977). Field trials: History, management and judging standards. San Diego: A.S. Barnes & Co. Inc.

Carter, K. (1986). Classroom management as cognitive problem solving: Toward teacher comprehension in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Carter, K. (1985).Teacher comprehension of classroom processes: An emerging direction in classroom management research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Carter, K., Sabers, D., Cushing K., Pinnegar, S., & Berliner, D.C. (in press). Processing and using information about students: A study of expert, novice, and postulant teachers. Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (n.d.a.). The national teacher of the year program. Washington, D.C.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (n.d.b.). The national teacher of the year award program: general instructions. Washington, D.C.

Goldsmid, C. A., Gruber, J. E., & Wilson, E. K. (1977). Perceived attributes of superior teachers (PAST): An inquiry into the giving of teaching awards. American Educational Research Journal.14 (4) 423-440.

Green, L. & Allen, L. (1984). Judgement Day. Women's Sports. 47, (8) 47-53.

Housner, L.D., & Griffey, D.C. (1985). Teacher cognition: Differences in planning and interactive decision-making between experienced and inexperienced teachers. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport. 56, 45-53.

Leinhardt, G. (1986). Expertise in mathematics teaching. Educational Leadership. 43, (7) 28-33.

Miller, M.S. (1986). 1986 Teacher of the Year. Good Housekeeping. 202,(5), 42-46.

Phillips, A. N. (1956). Horse shows: How to organize and run them. Danville, Ill: Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Rosenshine, R., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed). Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd edition (pp. 37-49). New York: Macmillan.

Tursman, C. (1981). Good teachers: what to look for. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.

Van Schaack, H. & Glick, I. D. (1982). A qualitative study of excellence in teaching: (and) An annotated bibliography. (Contract 400-78-0017) Washington, D.C.; National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 2213 660).

Wiedmer, T. L. (1983). Teachers of the Year 1978-1982: a profile and analysis. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Montana. (order No. DA 8321605).

Youtz, H. G. & Carlson, A. C. (1962). Judging livestock, dairy cattle, poultry, and crops. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Table 1
States in the Study Sample

Arizona	Massachusetts
Arkansas	Minnesota
California	Mississippi
Colorado	Montana
Connecticut	Nevada
Delaware	New Jersey
Florida	New Mexico
Georgia	New York
Idaho	North Dakota
Illinois	Oregon
Iowa	Pennsylvania
Kansas	Texas
Maine	Utah
Maryland	Washington